

LAW OFFICES OF  
**McGINN & GIBB, PLLC**

A PROFESSIONAL LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY  
PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, COPYRIGHTS, AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW  
8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD, SUITE 200  
VIENNA, VIRGINIA 22182-3817  
TELEPHONE: (703) 761-4100  
FACSIMILE/DATA: (703) 761-2375; 761-2376  
E-MAIL: MCGINNGIBB @ AOL.COM

**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER**  
**JUL 05 2005**

SEAN M. MCGINN  
PHILLIP E. MILLER†  
FREDERICK E. COOPERRIDER†  
JAMES E. HOWARD†  
JAMES N. DRESSER  
JOHN J. DRESCH  
SCOTT M. TULINO  
J. BRADLEY WRIGHT†  
†MEMBER OF BAR OTHER THAN VA

ANNAPOLIS, MD OFFICE  
FREDERICK W. GIBB, III  
MOHAMMAD S. RAHMANT  
PAMELA M. RILEY†

July 5, 2005

**VIA FACSIMILE**

To: Examiner Kathleen Prunner  
Group Art Unit: 3751  
U.S.P.T.O.

Facsimile No.: (703) 872-9306

From: James E. Howard

Facsimile No.: (703) 761-2375 or 76


Re: Enclosed Amendment Under 37 CFR §1.116  
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/026,467  
Docket No.: No.49

Dear Examiner Prunner:

Enclosed for filing is an Amendment Under 37 CFR §1.116 in response to the Final Office Action mailed on April 5, 2005, which should place the above-referenced case in condition for allowance.

Thank you in advance for your kind consideration on this case.

Very truly yours,

  
James E. Howard

JEH/geb

Enclosures

Total pages transmitted: 19

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
JUL 05 2005

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

**In re Application of**

Hidehei Kageyama et al.

**Serial No.:** 10/026,467      **Group Art Unit:** 3751

**Filed:** December 27, 2001      **Examiner:** Prunner, Kathleen

**For:** COMPOSITE HOLDING DEVICE

Honorable Commissioner of Patents  
Box AF  
Alexandria, VA 22313 - 1450

**AMENDMENT AFTER FINAL REJECTION UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.116**

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated April 5, 2005, please amend the above-identified application as follows:

**INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS**

Claims 1, 4-23, and 25-27 are all the claims presently pending in the application. Claims 6, 9, and 20 are amended to more clearly define the invention. Claims 1, 6, 11, 14, and 16-20 are independent.